

**Traveler Information
Routes of Significance Focus Group Meeting
Summary Meeting Notes
March 11, 2015**

Next Routes of Significance (RoS) Focus Group Meeting:

June 2015

Action Items:

- Caltrans Headquarters (HQ) will follow up with Kevin Korth with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to clarify what is expected for ITS Architecture in the 2016 report and share with the team (Jennifer Ashby-Camp).
- HQ will share the spreadsheet with the team that was sent to the districts for state proposed RoS (Jennifer Ashby-Camp).
- HQ will share an example of the minimum amount of data needed for the reporting provisions with the team (Mike Jenkinson).

Decision Points:

- An agenda item will be added to the next meeting to discuss the 2016 RoS process and future processes.
-

Introductions

1) HQ's Representatives:

- a. James Anderson – Chief, Office of Traffic Management
- b. Mike Jenkinson – IT Coordinator and Traveler Information, Office of Technology
- c. Jennifer Ashby-Camp – Traveler Information Coordinator, Office of Traffic Management
- d. Abteen Kashkouli – System Planning, Division of Transportation Planning (DOTP)

2) Caltrans' District Representatives:

- a. District 3 – None identified
- b. District 4 – Cameron Oakes (Planning)
- c. District 5 – Frank Boyle (Traffic Operations)
- d. District 7 – None identified
- e. District 8 – Mohammed Bendelhoum (Traffic Operations)
- f. District 11 – Shahin Sepassi and Gary Vettese (Traffic Operations)
- g. District 12 – Adam Siddiqui (Traffic Operations) and Sarah Chamberlain (Planning)

3) Agency Representatives:

- a. Iain Fairweather – Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)/Los Angeles County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (LA SAFE) and Yu-Ying Chu – Consultant, System Metrics Group, Inc.
- b. Kelly Lynn and Tim Byrne – San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG)
- c. Derrick Fesler – Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
- d. Chiachi Rumbolo – San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

Traveler Information
Routes of Significance Focus Group Meeting
Summary Meeting Notes
March 11, 2015

RoS criteria and submittal process

- 4) As a friendly reminder, March 27, 2015 is a critical date for HQ to have an idea of which agencies are not participating in the RoS effort at this time. Please notify Jennifer Ashby-Camp electronically via email on or before March 27, 2015 if your agency is not participating. To clarify, this only pertains to agencies who are not participating at this time.
- 5) For the agencies that are participating in the RoS effort at this time, please prepare and submit your packages electronically to Jennifer Ashby-Camp by April 10, 2015.

Technical session with Office of Technology representative Mike Jenkinson

- 6) Technical questions: MTC
 - a. *How soon should an agency start connecting their systems with HQ after a RoS package has been submitted and accepted by HQ in the Real-Time System Management Information Program (RTSMIP)?*
 - i. Mike Jenkinson stated questions can be addressed with HQ at any time. James Anderson clarified the best practice for the agency is to wait to coordinate the systems until after the package has been accepted in the RTSMIP, and Jennifer Ashby-Camp has notified the agency the package was accepted.
- 7) Technical questions: District 11
 - a. *Based on the criteria, what is HQ looking for if an agency proposes an arterial as a RoS?*
 - i. The FHWA defines RoS as non-Interstate highways (state highways and arterials) that merit the collection of traffic and travel condition information. Factors to consider in proposing RoS include roadway safety, public safety, economic productivity, severity and frequency of congestion and utility of the highway to serve as a diversion route for congestion locations.
 - b. *What type of information must be submitted to HQ?*
 - i. Data addressing construction activities, roadway or lane blocking incidents and roadway weather observations must be submitted to HQ; travel time information is only required on freeways (limited access roadways).
 - c. *Is HQ able to assist the agency in funding a system to provide the information?*
 - i. It is not the role of HQ to answer the question of program funding availability.
 - d. *How does a central database at HQ collect data from the agencies?*
 - i. The preferred method is the agency makes a file accessible (XML, CSV) and HQ will pull the data to the system. Some of the agencies such as MTC and SACOG have an existing external feed; therefore, HQ is not setting a XML standard schema and is capable of accepting different types of feeds. The RoS feed or publish will go directly from the agency to HQ (not through the district).
 - e. *What is the frequency of the feed?*
 - i. The frequency is between one and five minutes; not hourly.

Traveler Information
Routes of Significance Focus Group Meeting
Summary Meeting Notes
March 11, 2015

- f. *Where or in what central database is the data recorded at HQ?*
 - i. HQ is not recording the data at this time.

- 8) Technical questions: District 8
 - a. *How does HQ envision getting this data?*
 - i. HQ will provide an example of the minimum required data for the reporting provisions (e.g., closure location, type of closure, closure start/end, closure start time and estimated end time).
 - b. *Is the data feed real-time?*
 - i. The data feed is in real-time.
 - c. *Can a segment of a route be designated as a RoS, or does the full route need to be designated?*
 - i. A segment of a route can be designated as a RoS. For example, one of the factors to consider in designating RoS is freight movement. There is a significant amount of freight movement in District 8 with warehouses that are transfer locations that may be on a state highway. The segment of the route from the state highway to the Interstate could be designated as a RoS, and the reporting data is available to Caltrans because it is a state route. If the route is a city or county street, Caltrans is dependent on who has jurisdiction over the roadway and controls that information.

- 9) Technical questions: Districts 8 and 11
 - a. *What is the purpose of the spreadsheets sent to the districts regarding state proposed RoS?*
 - i. Each district received a spreadsheet with HQ's proposed RoS. The spreadsheet was not sent to the agencies as it is Caltrans' responsibility to propose state RoS. HQ is asking for district feedback by agreeing or disagreeing with the route, adding the route direction, segment description and starting and ending postmiles. The routes must have a Changeable Message Sign (CMS) that displays travel times into a metropolitan area. Each route in the spreadsheet proposed by HQ has the CMS location and postmile listed. Districts have the opportunity to propose additional state routes which have CMS displaying travel times into a metropolitan area.
 - ii. LA Metro and their consultant requested the spreadsheets with the state proposed RoS be shared with the team. To clarify, the routes listed on the spreadsheets are state proposed RoS and the districts are responsible for the state highways in their geographical area. The agencies do not need to consider these state proposed routes in their respective RoS packages. HQ is asking the districts to review, edit and finalize the state proposed RoS.

Traveler Information
Routes of Significance Focus Group Meeting
Summary Meeting Notes
March 11, 2015

- b. *Each CMS can have more than one target travel time (which change occasionally). How does the district address this on the spreadsheet?*
 - i. Each CMS can display multiple travel times and the postmile of the CMS is known and listed on the spreadsheet. CMS not used to display travel times should not be added to the spreadsheet. Start the segment reasonably near the CMS and end the segment at the displayed travel time location. In general, the CMS location represents the postmile start, and the postmile end will be the targeted travel time locations. Each target represents a travel time origin and destination if the CMS provides travel times into a metropolitan area. For example, a CMS can have three travel times end points:
 - 1. travel time 1: postmile x to postmile y
 - 2. travel time 2: postmile x to postmile z
 - 3. travel time 3: postmile x to postmile w
- 10) The Office of Traffic Management has asked the Office of Technology for a change to the ATMS (Advanced Traffic Management System) which has been green lighted by Brian Simi and will be in an upcoming Change Control Board (CCB). Instead of pulling travel times out of CMS message sets, there would be a separate output for segment travel times, beginning, end etc. which will be seen on state routes in the future.
- a. District 11 noted there are some bugs in the ATMS software that create issues for the districts and may impact the ability to meet the 85 percent accuracy and 90 percent availability requirements.
 - i. The Office of Technology will discuss this issue. HQ clarified the requirements for the data to be 85 percent accurate and available 90 percent of the time are directly from federal regulations.

Regional ITS Architecture

- 11) Technical questions: MTC
- a. *Is the agency required to submit the ITS Architecture as part of the RoS package?*
 - i. Each agency submitting RoS packages must include the ITS Architecture component.
- 12) Technical questions: Office of Technology
- a. *Is the agency required to submit the full ITS Architecture or submit user service packages impacted by the RoS?*
 - i. HQ will ask the FHWA for clarification on what is expected for Regional ITS Architecture in the 2016 RTSMIP report. The RoS checklist located on the intranet and internet provides additional guidance on Regional ITS Architecture.
 - 1. Intranet: <http://traffic.onramp.dot.ca.gov/traveler>
 - 2. Internet: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trafmgmt/traveler/>

**Traveler Information
Routes of Significance Focus Group Meeting
Summary Meeting Notes
March 11, 2015**

13) Technical questions: District 8

- a. *How does the National ITS Architecture relate to Regional ITS Architecture, and is it mainly a planning function?*
 - i. The National ITS Architecture structure, user services and how they are defined is in the national plan. Each agency and Caltrans submits their ITS Architectures with planning documents to meet these requirements. For example, an agency may have specific user service packages available for Traveler Information. Joan Sollenberger's office handles the Strategic Planning statewide at HQ and works with local districts on planning as needed. This is mainly a planning function, but in terms of the RTSMIP, it crosses over with the technical component that impacts both districts and HQ technology.

14) Technical questions: District 11

- a. *Has the Regional ITS Architecture been addressed from the state perspective in regard to the districts and HQ?*
 - i. Joan Sollenberger at HQ has worked with the districts, and the Regional ITS Architecture component for Interstates and most state routes has been addressed.
 - ii. Regional ITS Architecture is an ongoing planning activity.

Action Items

- 15) The Office of Technology had an action item from the last meeting to provide Caltrans' preferred methodology for route descriptor fields. Caltrans does not require the classification of the roadway. For example, when reporting a closure due to repaving, HQ needs to know the beginning and ending cross street for the route, start time and estimated end. In the example of a weather event such as a mudslide, this is similar to a closure and HQ needs the beginning and ending cross street for the route and the impact, such as poor visibility, slick or closed roadways.
- a. From the district perspective, HQ has the systems in place for data related to the reporting provisions on state highways. From the agency perspective, HQ does not have any data and is completely dependent on the agencies providing the necessary data.
 - b. Mike Jenkinson will provide examples of the minimum necessary indicators for the team. The definitions of each field variable can be seen at Caltrans' link to LCS. XML and JSON examples can be found on Caltrans' link to CWWP2/LCS.
 - i. LCS: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/cwwp2/documentation/lcs/lcs-field-description.htm>
 - ii. CWWP2/LCS: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/cwwp2/documentation/lcs/lcs.htm>

Next Steps

- 16) An agenda item will be added the next quarterly meeting to address the 2016 process and future processes. The RoS deadlines were covered previously in the meeting.

Traveler Information
Routes of Significance Focus Group Meeting
Summary Meeting Notes
March 11, 2015

Adjourn

- 17) The continual efforts of the team are appreciated as we move toward the upcoming deadlines. HQ hopes to give an overview of the number of the RoS that were selected at the next quarterly meeting, as well as an overall status on what HQ hopes to submit to the FHWA in the near future.